



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,995	06/20/2001	Wataru Yamamoto	08215.125	2414
7590 02/23/2004			EXAMINER	
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White Suite 240 6550 Rock Spring Drive Bethesda, MD 20817			OLSEN, KAJ K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1753	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/883,995

Applicant(s)

YAMAMOTO, WATARU

Examiner

Kaj Olsen

Art Unit

1753

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 16 January 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claim 1 is now allowable.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached discussion.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2,3.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11-17-2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant continues to urge that the cathode cartridge of fig. 10 cannot be read on the anode cartridge of the rejected claims. In particular, applicant urges that claim 2 is drawn to a anode cartridge "for electroplating of the testing device for electroplating of the present invention" (after-final response p. 5). However, what the applicant described is the intended use of the cartridge. Applicant is clearly not claiming the actual testing device or the cathode cartridge, but merely the anode cartridge to be utilized with the testing device and cathode cartridge. What the cathode cartridge of fig. 10 is utilized for is irrelevant because it has all the claimed cartridge structure of claims 2 and 3 and hence would clearly be capable of functioning as an anode cartridge. Whether or not an electrode functions as an anode or cathode is a function of the polarity of the unclaimed voltage applied across the electrodes.
2. Applicant also refers to the fact that the cathode cartridge of fig. 10 contains the plated base 32 in contrast to the typical use of an anode cartridge. First, the intended use of the cartridge is irrelevant as discussed above. Second, the claims are constructed with *open* language (i.e. it's "comprising" a number of elements), and there is nothing in the rejected claims that states that there cannot be a plated base contained therein.
3. The applicant also discusses how anode and cathode cartridges are conventionally utilized in the art. The examiner will not dispute applicant's discussion, but the examiner fails to understand how this obviates the fact that all the elements of claims 2 and 3 are taught in the drawings and discussion of fig. 10.

Art Unit: 1753

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaj Olsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1344. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen, can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kaj Olsen Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
AU 1753  
February 18, 2004